

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

No amendments to the specification are submitted herewith.

In the amended Figure of the new drawing submitted herewith, the previously omitted fluid connection flow line between the temperature transducer 61 and the entry orifice 44 has been added.

Claims 1-9 remain in the application. Claim 1 has been amended and a new claim 10 added.

In applying the Williams patent to original claim 1, page 2 of the Office action refers to column 4, lines 23-54 in such patent and to the disclosure therein of a part (50) (so-called Venturi nozzle) as corresponding to the claim recitation: "orifice means connecting the heat exchange means to the flash chamber for flashing conversion of the wastewater preheated in the heat exchange means into water vapor rising into the upper section of the flash chamber". However according to the disclosure in the Williamson patent as set forth in column 2, lines 49-54, the part 50 is a distillate discharge line connected to the outlet of a pump 48 and to a line 52 from a distillate cooler 72. Accordingly, such line 50 as disclosed in the Williamson patent does not connect a heat exchanger to a flash chamber for conversion of preheated wastewater into a rising water vapor within a flash chamber as called for in the latter quoted recitation of claim 1. On this account alone the rejections of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103 over the Williamson patent as stated in the Office action are in error.

Furthermore in regard to the Williamson patent, it is stated on page 3 of the Office action that: "(46) of Williamson--correspond to the claimed--filter means within the flash chamber for limiting extraction from the rising water vapor to a condensate". However according to the actual disclosure in the Williamson patent, the part (46) is a line through which condensate is

drawn from a condenser 44 by a pump 48, rather than constituting a filter within a flash chamber for limiting extraction of condensate, as called for in the latter quoted recitation of claim 1. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103 over the Williamson patent are therefore in error on another account.

In regard to the Kowalski patent, alternatively relied to reject claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or 35 U.S.C. 103(a), pages 2-3 in the Office action refers to (1) a liquid entrant orifice and Venturi as being disclosed in column 2, lines 49-52 of the Kowalski patent and (2) a mesh separator (33). Such two portions (1) and (2) of the Kowalski patent are alleged to respectively correspond to the two previously quoted recitations of original claim 1. However according the portion (1) of the disclosure in the Kowalski patent referred to by the Examiner, the liquid entrant orifice is formed in the bottom wall 21 through which infeed of seawater is received, while the entrant venturi (51-55-53) cooperating therewith is also disposed on such bottom wall on the inside of the back wall. According to other portions of the disclosure in the Kowalski patent, after the latter referred to infeed through the bottom wall 21 the seawater is fed up into a heater 35 at the top wall 19 before delivery through conduit 81 to the flash chamber of stage 30 through the back wall venturi located at the bottom and between the two flash chambers of the flash stages 23 and 25. The foregoing referred arrangement of the flash evaporator disclosed in the Kowalski patent contrasts sharply with that of the wastewater processor as set forth in claim 1 limited to a flash chamber with upper and lower sections, and as now emphasized by amendments expressly limiting the processor to a single flash chamber.

As to the other limitations of claims 2-9 dependent from amended claim 1, the disclosure in the Miller patent relied in regard thereto as set forth in the Office action is not relevant to the

limitations set forth in such parent claim 1 which distinguish over the Williamson and Kowalski patents as hereinbefore pointed out.

A new claim 10 is submitted which corresponds generally to the claim in the Williamson patent, but distinguishes sharply thereover in several respects. Thus, new claim 10 specifies in sharp contrast to recitations in the Williamson patent claim: "heating the wastewater to--175°F;-- passing the heated wastewater through an entry orifice--for conversion during a single evaporation stage; withdrawing the contaminate portion--for storage as a waste; and discharging the condensate distillate upon said collection thereof--".

In view of the foregoing, an allowance of claims 1-10 is believed to be in order and is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,



JACOB SHUSTER, Reg. No. 19,660
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Tele: (301) 227-1835

OFFICE OF COUNSEL CODE 39
NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER
CARDEROCK DIVISION HEADQUARTERS
DAVID TAYLOR MODEL BASIN
9500 MACARTHUR BOULEVARD
WEST BETHESDA, MD 20817-5700